

REMARKS

This reply is being resubmitted in view of the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated March 7, 2005, and is meant to replace the reply filed December 10, 2004. As required by the Notice, the identifier for claim 55 has been corrected.

Claims 40-65 are pending in the application, with claims 40, 47 and 55 being independent. Claims 40, 47 and 55 have been amended and dependent claims 63-65 have been added.

Claims 47-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response to this rejection, claim 47 has been amended to recite that the previously recited formula defines a luminescent material, a thin film of which is included in an electroluminescent element of the claimed light emitting device. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection in view of the amendment of claim 47.

Independent claims 40, 47 and 54 all have been amended to recite that the semiconductor component is operated by signals each having one of predetermined two voltages. Support for this amendment may be found in the application at, for example, page 19, lines 9-12, which notes the use of digital driving.

Support for new claims 63-65 may be found in the application at, for example, page 15, line 13 to page 19, line 20. No new matter has been added.

Claims 47-54 have been rejected as being anticipated by Forrest, U.S. Patent No. 6,310,360, and by Hosokawa, U.S. Patent No. 6,660,410. Claim 47 has been amended to include the feature of "an electroluminescent element electrically connected to the semiconductor component." As conceded by the Examiner, neither Forrest nor Hosokawa describes or suggests this feature. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections in view of this amendment.

Claims 40-46 and 55-62 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Forrest in view of Arai, U.S. Patent No. 6,160,272. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Forrest, Arai, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a

semiconductor component to which an electroluminescent element is connected and that is operated by signals each having one of predetermined two voltages, as recited in each of the independent claims.

The Examiner contends that Forrest teaches, at col. 1, lines 5-67, that the light emitting device is operated by signals having a voltage selected from two voltages. However, that passage, which recites that the intensity and color of the emitted light are independently varied and controlled with external power supplies, in no way describes or suggests operating a semiconductor device using signals each having one of predetermined two voltages. Arai does not remedy this failure of Forrest.

Claim 40 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Hosokawa in view of Arai. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Hosokawa, Arai, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a semiconductor component to which an electroluminescent element is connected and that is operated by signals each having one of predetermined two voltages, as recited in claim 40. The Examiner appears to rely on the recitation in Forrest that the intensity and color may be independently varied as support for this element of the claim. However, as discussed above, this portion of Forrest provides no such support.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.
Serial No. : 10/754,701
Filed : January 12, 2004
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-276002 / US4942D1

No fees are believed to be due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,


John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Date: March 17, 2005

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40271973.doc